



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 21, 2017

Mr. M. Matthew Ribitzki
Deputy City Attorney
City of Burleson
141 West Renfro
Burleson, Texas 76028

OR2017-05771

Dear Mr. Ribitzki:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 656538 (Burleson ORR# 464).

The City of Burleson (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified complaint. You state the city will redact certain information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), and Open Records Letter No. 2016-08169 (2016).¹ You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the

¹Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without requesting a decision from this office under the Act. *Id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold specific categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. Open Records Letter No. 2016-08169 authorizes the department to withhold the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a decision from this office.

Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer’s privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978)*. The informer’s privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” *Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981)* (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton Rev. Ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988)*. However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer’s privilege. The privilege excepts the informer’s statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer’s identity. *Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990)*. We note the informer’s privilege does not apply where the informant’s identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See ORD 208 at 1-2*.


You state some of the submitted information identifies a complainant who reported a violation of a city ordinance to the city’s code enforcement department, which is responsible for enforcing the relevant portions of the city ordinance. You also state a violation of the relevant city ordinance carries civil or criminal penalties. You state the subject of the complaint does not already know the identity of the informer. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer’s privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the city may withhold the identifying information of the complainant under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. The city must release the remaining information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at <http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/>

[orl_ruling_info.shtml](#), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paige Thompson". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "P".

Paige Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/eb

Ref: ID# 656538

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)